

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/020,760	10/29/2001	Takaaki Takeda	P/2291-107	8688	
75	590 05/31/2006	EXAMINER			
Steven I. Weis	sburd, Esq.	SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A			
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP					
41st Floor		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
1177 Avenue of the Americas			2154		
New York, NY 10036-2714			DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/020,760	TAKEDA, TAKAAKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154		

Advisory Action	10/020,760	TAKEDA, TAKAAKI				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
,	Mohammad A. Siddiqi	2154				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
• •		•				
HE REPLY FILED <u>03 May 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS  3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered becau	1150			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•		136			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•	•	•			
<ul> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying the i	issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		moliant Amendment (PT)	OL -324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		inpliant Americanent (i 10	JL-024).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		timely filed amendment o	anceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an expla	anation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	it hefers or on the data of filing a M	ation of Appeal will not be	antorod			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	it or other evidence is ne	cessary and			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to				
<ol><li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li></ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration.	ered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for allo	wance			
because: See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13. Other:  JOHN FOLLANSBEE						
SUPERV (*)RY PATENT EXAMINER  TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100						
·						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to Applicant's argument filed on 05/03/2006, Shaio does not teach "extracting first feature information from the inflow block of data at the ingress, wherein the first feature information identifies the inflow block of data", examiner respectfully disagrees, Shaio teaches extracting (col 9, lines 47-53) first feature information from the inflow block of data (col 3, lines 20-27) at the ingress (converting RESV message into control message includes step of extracting, col 6 lines 17-53), wherein the first feature information identifies (Fig 8C of the instant application can only be interpreted as a data packet) the inflow (col 3, lines 20-27) block of data (fig 9, col. 3, lines 20-28; col. 9, lines 47-51, extracts the control messages), sending the first feature information from the ingress to the egress (converting RESV message to control message for egress, col 6, lines 17-53). Shaio also teaches determining whether the first feature information extracted at the ingress matches the second feature information extracted at the egress (steps 222, 240, tag 238, Fig. 13; Fig. 12; col 6, lines 47-53; col 11, lines 35-67; col 12, lines 1-9, finding short cut includes extracting and matching). Sufleta discloses extracting second feature information from the outflow block of data at the egress, wherein the second feature information identifies the outflow block of data (elements of fig 9; col 10, lines 52-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Shaio and Sufleta. The motivation would have been monitoring a Quality-of-Service parameters over the network and constantly matching the signatures supplied by the probes to confirm delivery and obtain packet travel time.